

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to claim 1 for informalities; and rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,655,053 to *Renie* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0007311 by Iseki et al. ("*Iseki*").

By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-5. Thus, claims 1-5 remain pending and under current examination.

Regarding the objection to claim 1, Applicant amends claim 1 to delete all instances of the phrase "such as." Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is definite, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraws the objection to this claim.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Renie* in view of *Iseki*.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "mobile recording medium manufactured specifically for an event" including "material information" and "a program."

Renie discloses a personalized video system for "acquiring video of an individual consumer as shot at an amusement park or the like and combining those images with standard, preshot video of rides or attractions" (Abstract). The system disclosed in *Renie* includes a network, video cameras, processors, memory, and controller (see Fig. 1). However, *Renie* fails to disclose that such a system is "mobile" and "manufactured specifically for an event," as required by claim 1. Also, the "ticket" issued to users in

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Renie (see Col. 5, line 51), does not contain “material information” or “a program,” as required by claim 1.

Iseki fails to overcome this deficiency. Although *Iseki* discloses a digital album registering and opening system, *Iseki* is silent with respect to a “mobile recording medium manufactured specifically for an event” including “material information” and “a program,” as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over *Renie* and *Iseki*. Claims 2-4 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Independent claim 5, although of different scope than claim 1, patentably distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 25, 2009

By: 

Jia W. Lu
Reg. No. 61,543
202-408-4000